REMARKS:

In the Office Action, Claims 1-6, 9-10, 12-14, 16-22, and 24-26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 (e) as being anticipated by Manuel et al. Because Manuel et al. is alleged to be prior art under 35 U.S.C. §102(e), and Applicants reserve the right to antedate this reference. Even if Manuel et al. qualifies as prior art, Claims 1-6, 9-10, 12-14, 16-22, and 24-26 are patentable for at least the following reasons.

Focusing now on independent Claims 1, 13, 20, and 22, each of these claims recites, in one form or another, accessing a stored indication of a user's language preference in response to a query that is initiated at or received from a calling or user's telephone station. Thus, these claims recite accessing an indication of a language preference that is associated with a ***calling party*** in response to a query that is ***generated upon receipt of the call***. As explained in more detail below, Manuel et al. does not disclose these features.

Claim 1 recites, in part: (i) generating a query in response to a terminating attempt trigger that is ***activated upon receipt of a call initiated at the user's telephone station***; and (ii) accessing a stored indication of the ***user's language preference in response to the query***.

Claim 13 recites, in part: (i) a terminating switch operable to generate a query in response to a terminating attempt trigger that is ***activated upon receipt of a call from a calling telephone station***; and (ii) a processor coupled with the terminating switch, the processor being operable to access the stored indication of the ***user's language preference in response to the receipt of the query transmitted from the terminating switch***.

Claim 20 recites, in part, a second computer readable program code for causing a computer to access the stored indication of the ***user's language preference in response to a query***, wherein the stored indication of the user's language preference identifies a preferred

language for transmitting announcements to the calling telephone station, and wherein the query is generated in response to a terminating attempt trigger that is ***activated in response to the receipt of a call from a calling telephone station***.

Claim 22 recites, in part: (i) receiving, at an originating switch, ***a call from the calling telephone station***; (ii) generating a terminating attempt trigger, using a terminating switch, ***upon receipt of the call from the originating switch***; and (iii) accessing a stored indication of ***a user's language preference***, using a processor, ***in response to the query***.

Manuel et al. discloses a system whereby a call processing record of a ***called party*** is accessed using a query. (Col. 10, lines 40-59; Figure 3). Indeed the call processing record of a ***calling party*** on only retrieved after the call processing record of the ***called party*** has been retrieved and analyzed. (Col. 10, lines 60-62; Figure 3). Manuel et al. does not disclose that the call processing record is retrieved in response to a query that is generated upon receipt of a call that is initiated at or received from a calling or user's telephone station, as recited in Claims 1, 13, 20, and 22. Accordingly, Claims 1, 13, 20, 22, and all depending claims, are patentable over Manuel et al. for at least these reasons.

Claims 7-8, 15, and 23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Manuel et al. in view of Caccuro et al. Applicants submit that there is no motivation or suggestion to combine the teachings of these references, as suggested by the Examiner, and the proposed combination is the result of nothing more than using the claimed invention as a blueprint to pick-and-choose isolated elements from the prior art. Accordingly, Claims 7-8, 15, and 23 are patentable over the proposed combination for this reason alone. Even if these references could be properly combined, because Claims 7-8, 15, and 23 depend from Claims 1, 13, and 22, they are patentable for at least the reasons stated above.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicants submit that this case is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner feels that a telephone interview would be helpful in resolving any remaining issues, the Examiner is respectfully invited to contact Applicants' undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

Jason C. White
Registration No. 42,223
Attorney for Applicants

BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE
P.O. Box 10395
Chicago, Illinois 60610